

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DAVID HIEBER,

Case No. 22-11417

Plaintiff,

F. Kay Behm

v.

United States District Judge

OAKLAND COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

_____ /

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR STATUS CONFERENCE (ECF No. 59),
DENYING MOTION TO EXPEDITE HEARING (ECF No. 49), and
DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (ECF No. 60)**

On August 15, 2023, Plaintiff filed a motion for a status conference (ECF No. 59), seeking to have his motion to enforce the settlement agreement (ECF No. 29), which is scheduled for hearing on September 27, 2023, heard before he is required to file a response to Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 63) because if the court grants the motion to enforce the settlement, the motion for summary judgment will presumably be moot. The court held a status conference on August 31, 2023 and thus, this motion is **GRANTED**. Further, the court will determine at the hearing on September 27, 2023 the deadline for Plaintiff's response to the motion for summary judgment and that deadline is held in abeyance until then. Next, Plaintiff's motion to expedite the hearing on the

motion to enforce the settlement is also therefore **DENIED** as moot. (ECF No. 49). Finally, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of this court's decision to extend the time for Defendants to file their motion for summary judgment and exceed the page limit is **DENIED** as that decision is well within the exercise of this court's discretion (ECF No. 60). *See e.g., S.S. v. E. Ky. Univ.*, 532 F.3d 445, 451 (6th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Wright v. Murray Guard, Inc.*, 455 F.3d 702, 714 (6th Cir. 2006)) ("The interpretation and application of local rules 'are matters within the district court's discretion.'"); *Anthony v. BTR Auto. Sealing Sys., Inc.*, 339 F.3d 506, 516 (6th Cir. 2003) ("[T]rial courts have inherent power to control their dockets.").

SO ORDERED.

Date: September 1, 2023

s/F. Kay Behm

F. Kay Behm

United States District Judge